

issue at hand, forget the resolution itself as a secondary concern and I would ask you to uphold the Chair's ruling. I appreciate your support for that and perhaps those of you who voted the other way yesterday would reconsider and recognize that we made a mistake not to go back to the policy we have had so many years in this body.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DECAMP: Mr. Chairman or Mr. President, I am satisfied the Chair made the proper ruling the other day and the rules are specific. However, I want to determine if this case before the body now is distinguishable, distinguishable from my motion the other day. And I would ask the indulgence of the body splitting hairs a little bit but may I ask the Clerk? The rule says that it takes 25 votes. It has a comma, provided the motion is made within three legislative days after the committee makes its report to the Legislature. Has that been complied with?

SENATOR BEUTLER: Senator DeCamp, the Clerk doesn't engage in exchanges but the answer is, no, it has not been complied with.

SENATOR DECAMP: So I think this is a clearly distinguishable case then. The rule clearly says that it applies, it is a very specific rule and it sets up specific standards, so it would seem the ruling of the Chair didn't deal with that aspect nor did Senator Wesely's objection deal with that aspect. If the ruling of the Chair were on that basis, I can see the Chair would be completely correct. However, if the Chair ruled strictly on the basis that it has ruled so far, that we were wrong the other day, then I think the Chair should be overruled. And, as I say, this is a "clearly distinguishable case" because my motion was filed according to those rules strictly within the three days and apparently this is a different situation. So at least don't try to say this sets the precedent...this sets the precedent for the future on this issue because this rule is here, I followed it and now this is a different situation. It is not "a cow case". So on the basis of the ruling given by the Chair, his reasons, I am going to vote to overrule the Chair because the objection was not made on the proper grounds. Does anybody understand what I am saying? It is a technical point but it is a distinguishable case and I don't want my ruling looking like it was favoritism when, in fact,